DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 331 UD 016 047

AUTHOR Gordon, Edmund W.; Fahrer, Kimberly
TITLE Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. The Current State of the Art and Recommendations for Change [and] A Review of the Studies of the Programs.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Inst. for Urban and Minority Education.; Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 17p.; First paper based on speech delivered at the Conference on Higher Education Opportunity Programs (Syracuse, New York, April 15, 1975); Second paper exerpted from ED 114 028
AVAILABLE FROM Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027 ($1.00)
JOURNAL CIT IRCD Bulletin; v11 n1 p1-15 Winter 1976

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Change Agents; Change Strategies; *Compensatory Education Programs; Curriculum Planning; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Policy; Failure Factors; Financial Policy; Financial Support; *Higher Education; Low Income Groups; Minority Groups; *Policy Formation; *Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public Policy; Social Change; Success Factors

ABSTRACT

These two articles focus on opportunity programs in higher education, the first of which notes that the state of the art of designing and delivering these programs is confused, contradictory, and yet encouraging. Positive and negative research findings and program variation contributes to the confused state of the art. Another problem concerns the indicators used to define the target population. These may be insufficiently sensitive to either plan adequately for educational experiences or to evaluate program effectiveness. The status of the programs is contradictory in part because the roles and purposes of the institutions in which they exist are contradictory. Overall, effects of programs is positive, even if limitedly so. When adequately supported and implemented, college completion rate is high and attrition low. Among recommendations for change include the following: the establishment of free or low cost continuing post secondary education, development of improved diagnostic assessment technology, and matching of student characteristics to institutional capabilities. A review of the studies of the program is provided in the second article, which notes that policy changes have occurred in three broad areas in the structure of higher education: admissions/recruitment, financial aid, and curriculum. The practical responses to the necessity for change in these areas are then discussed as well as the theoretical issues involved. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED123331

IRCD Bulletin

A Publication of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University
and Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

Volume XI, Number 1 Winter 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Equal Opportunity in Higher Education

Edmund W. Gordon

The Current State of the Art and Recommendations for Change

The title of this paper suggests that we are talking about a set of behaviors or practices which are not sufficiently precise to be defined as science. When we talk about the art of a field we're really talking about the more intuitive naturalistic expression of it and it is true that the field of collegiate programs for the disadvantaged is characterized by somewhat free swinging behavior. However, although we tend to function more intuitively and our work tends to be pragmatic and we are somewhat eclectic, in a number of situations we do somehow succeed in making music, in painting pictures—we do end up helping a number of young people. We see many of our clients grow in ways that they would not otherwise grow if our services were not available to them. Thus, although the state of the art of designing and delivering opportunity programs is confused, is contradictory, is conditional, it is also encouraging. If we take a look at our overall effects these have been surprisingly positive, even if limitedly so. I say surprising because if one looks at the history of what we are about, as it has been suggested we do, we

continued on page 2

EDMUND W. GORDON, Ed.D., is Executive Director of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, and Senior Research Scientist, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.

Speech delivered at the Conference on Higher Education Opportunity Programs, Syracuse, New York, April 15, 1975.

A Review of the Studies of the Programs

The New York State Regents have said, "We assume that persons of the various ethnic and racial groups in our society aspire to and are capable of obtaining all the various levels of educational achievement in approximately the same proportions. Such is not the case because social conditions have made the attainment of these various levels more difficult for some sectors of the population" (New York State Department of Education 1975, P. 10)). One would think the amelioration of this inequitable situation should be one of this society's greatest concerns.

In some measure society has responded, but higher education's commitment to programs for disadvantaged students varies greatly. Astin (1972) describes a "pyramidical system... roughly composed of three groups: a few prestigious and wealthy institutions that, in fact, enroll only high achievers; a large number of 'middle' colleges that enroll a somewhat more

continued on page 7

Excerpted from *Opportunity Programs for the Disadvantaged in Higher Education*, Research Report No. 6, 1975, prepared for the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, and published by the American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C. The entire report is available from AAHE and the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Arlington, Va., as ED 114 028.

Prepared with the assistance of Kimberly Fahrer

UD 016 047

came into existence in a hurry and were given the most difficult task that universities have had at a time when we were relatively unprepared for it: we have operated under the most politically, socially and economically disadvantaged conditions. Yet, if we look at the data from the U.S. Office of Education Study conducted by J. Davis, or the study that I did for the Ford Foundation, or the recent report published by the New York State Department of Education, all of these studies in one way or another document the effectiveness of our work.* These data tend to show that when programs with adequate support systems are operative, attrition rates are significantly lower. When these programs are in operation and are adequately supported, adequately implemented, the completion rate is significantly higher than the overall national rate; for youngsters who have been exposed to the good programs, grade point averages are significantly higher. Clearly, there is evidence which increases daily to indicate that college completion rates for opportunity students equal or exceed college completion rates for the nation as a whole.

Confusing Evidence and Contradictory Institutions

If we go back to the early Clark and Plotkin study, we find that these completion rates were phenomenal for U.S. higher education.* If we take completion over four or five years, and not concern ourselves strictly with excellence or grade point average, we see that opportunity students can make it, are making it, are doing well, are in many cases doing better than the norm for the nation. Despite these very positive signs, however, the recently opened doors of opportunity too often have proved to be revolving doors. In too many instances our target students leave college within one year of entry or, if they have remained longer, we find that they have accumulated little credit which is applicable to their college degree and often, perhaps more serious, have developed negative attitudes toward higher education and continuing education as a result of negative and destructive experiences in our institutions. In some less well conceived efforts, expectation levels have been raised far higher than what we are able to produce. They were raised high not only in the students' minds but, even more serious, also excessively high in the minds of the public; as the students fail to produce at that level proponents of more higher educational opportunities for the poor have gotten a kind of backlash.

These positive and negative findings contribute to the confused state of our art, and those who would destroy us for any available reason happily seize upon these mixed reports by focusing on the more negative findings to bolster their arguments for reduced support. I assert that our status is confused and open to criticism because, with a few exceptions, our data are incomplete, weak, and often nonexistent. As we study this field, we find that there are very few good evaluation studies; often we have been too busy delivering services or defending our programs from attack to study them. Often in our efforts at protecting these programs from premature examination we have also precluded evaluation. In the two studies of this field that I have done many of my friends and colleagues have said quite honestly, "You know, Ed, we would like you to look at what we are doing, but we don't want anyone disturbing these kids; they are under attack from so many sources, the odds are so greatly stacked against them, it's better that we not study them at all." Their position was understandable; however, although it may have been correct a few years ago, increasingly, the welfare, the progress, the status of these programs are going to be influenced by the extent to which we can produce solid data about their nature and effect.

Our knowledge about the status of these programs is also confused because the populations they serve are ill-defined; generally our indicators are ethnicity, income level, prior educational experiences, geographic origin. These may be insufficiently sensitive indicators to either plan adequately for educational experiences or to evaluate adequately the effectiveness of programs. It may be that functional characteristics of the persons we serve would be more important indicators. I will talk further about functional characteristics when I make some comments about assessment, but basically what I am suggesting here is that knowing the ethnic origin or economic level of the student may not give us the appropriate leads with respect to intervening in educational support for that student; we need to know more about the functional nature of the student—about the nature of the adaptive processes he uses to master learning tasks.

Another reason for the confusion is that programs are quite varied; the Higher Education Opportunity Program designation is not a sign that opportunity programs of higher quality are being delivered, nor does it guarantee that if quality programs are available they are offered in a climate that makes them acceptable to the intended recipients. Thus, when we evaluate HEOP programs—and this goes for compensatory education in general—the fact that the program has been called compensatory or HEOP is insufficient information. We need far more information about the specific nature of a particular program, and equally important, the context in which that program functions.

The status of our programs is contradictory in part because the roles and purposes of the institutions in which they exist are contradictory—a reflection of the contradictions in the society

*See refererences of companion article.

IRCD Bulletin

Published quarterly by the Institute for Urban and Minority Education. Subscription rate: $4.00 per year. Back issues: 1-9 copies, $1.00 each; 10-24 copies, $0.80 each; 25-49 copies, $0.60 each; 50 copies and over, $0.50 each.

Edmund W. Gordon, Editor

Send all communications to: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

The Institute for Urban and Minority Education is an agency for human resource development and school organization improvement in the nation's cities. Founded in 1973, the Institute is jointly sponsored by the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, and Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

which has given birth to them. Mao Tse Tung has written a beautiful essay on contradiction. He reminds us that it is a feature of all phenomena; everything has its opposites, and to complicate things even more, these contradictions are in dynamic states, that is, they are in a consistent and constant state of change. When one aspect of the contradiction is in the ascendancy, the opposite is in the descendancy; the fact that aspect A of the contradiction is ascending today does not mean that it will always be in the ascending position—it may reverse itself. The trick, of course, is to recognize the actual position of these polar extremes at a given point in time and to adjust one's behavior or one's program in relation to them.

Jean Paul Sartre has also struggled with the paradox of contradiction and fortunately has recognized its impact in the role and function of the intellectual as well as in the role and function of those institutions charged with the responsibility for the nurturance of intellect, such as the university. Intellectuals and universities in their roles as nurturers of intellect are caught in a paradox of contradiction because they are, by their very nature, conservationist or conservative—conservative of the traditions, the collective experience, the acquired knowledge of man. Paradoxically, however, one who has acquired intellect has in the process become committed to criticism which can only give birth to change. Intellect and inteliect-producing institutions then are at one and the same time conservative and revolutionary. The intellectual and the universities tend to be liberal; in our society they have traditionally been the advocates of democracy; because of their heightened understanding and sensitivity they are more likely to be humanitarian; still, we have yet to discover a way of nurturing and rewarding intellect that is not elitist or at least meritocratic rather than democratic. The university is a society-serving institution; however, in order to achieve this purpose, which includes the nurturance of the society's intellect, it seems to have to be insulated from the society it serves. It is stimulating of change and diversity, but it is nurturing of conformity. It is ideally committed to the development of intellect, but functionally committed to producing credentials and skills. What my friend and mentor W.E.B. DuBois called "The Liberating Arts and Sciences" have come to be thought of as rather useless as vocational, technical and professional programs have flourished.

This contradiction between the idealized commitment and the functional development of the university has been discussed in another context by Anthony Wallace, the anthropologist.* He talks about education and its roles and functions in societies in different phases of their development; it may be that Wallace's treatment of the contradiction most clearly points to the relevance of contradiction in education of the poor. Wallace talks about morality, intellect and skills as essential purposes of education and the dialectical or dynamic relationship of these three purposes as societies move from their revolutionary phase to a conservative phase to a reactionary phase. He suggests that in the conservative society first attention is given to skill development because the development of skills is essential to the maintenance of that society; he argues that next level attention is given to moral development which I see as socialization, how one gets along in the society; and only third level attention is given to the development of intellect. By the time society reaches its reactionary phase, moral development is at the top again, but now moral development has become law and order. "What does the State expect of me?" Second level attention is given to skill development—techniques—"How do I serve the society?" and little or no attention is given to intellect. Wallace wrote that essay in 1960, but it is interesting to see how appropriate it is to the late 1960's and the early 1970's, when the university came under attack and when the greatest attention in our society with regard to education was given to career education, vocational education. Our expectation of our public schools, of our universities, and of our colleges was to teach people how to enter the labor force, how to become productive persons. Wallace reminds us that in none of these phases of societal development is primary attention given to the development of intellect; intellect tends to be neglected in all of them, or at least it tends not to have priority in any of them.

A point Wallace does not make is that the various elements of society move through these phases at different rates so that while the dominant interest of the ruling group in the society may be conservative or reactionary, as we can see in this country over the recent period, there are elements in the society that may be in a revolutionary phase. If we look at the young people whom we are concerned with—at poor people, at ethnic minorities, at low status people—we find that they are, or should be, very much concerned with change, with *radical change and revolution*, rather than conservatism and reaction. We are in a position in which the university puts conservatism and reaction in the ascendency and revolution in a descending position while the young people we are trying to introduce into the system that the university represents have a different set of values—revolutionary values. This conflict becomes a force that is a drag upon successful upward movement of these young people. Thus when the university reaches out to democratize but uses elitist models in the service of a reactionary society, the contradictions are so obvious that it should come as no surprise that we fail as often as we succeed.

The status of our program is also conditional because in its conservative or reactionary phase the nation is turning from expanding opportunity to *conserving* opportunity, from a democratic back to a meritocratic, and maybe even an aristocratic, basis for the selection and support of students. Here I refer to the steadily rising cost of higher education coupled with the erosion of opportunity for the poor as a function of the conservation of opportunity for the middle income group. My interest is not to pit one group against the other, but if we are going to increase the pool of the eligible candidates to include lower income groups, as I think we should, we must also increase the pool of resources to accomodate the added numbers and the increased costs. If we are to protect our programs and reduce their conditional state, it may be necessary to form an alliance between those who would *conserve* opportunity and those of us who would *expand* opportunity.

*Anthony Wallace. *Social and Cultural Foundations of Guidance*. N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968

Recommendations for Change

With the encouraging but confused and contradictory state of our programs, what do we know about this art which can guide us as we seek to expand access to and completion of higher education in a democratic, diverse and pluralistic society? First I place the establishment of continuing postsecondary education at low cost or free as a right of citizenship. That would be a radical move in a society where neither secondary nor elementary education was always universally available but it is a goal to shoot for. For the present, at least, we must insist upon expanded and subsidized higher education opportunities for the poor as well as for low middle income families. Second, we must develop improved student diagnostic assessment technology. I have written and talked a great deal recently about diagnostic and prescriptive approaches to education, something I call qualitative approaches to assessment and prescriptive approaches to educational design. The idea is simply to move away from the assessment of status, to move away from the heavy dependence on the quantification of behavior to a greater emphasis on the qualitative description of behavior, description of the *processes* by which individuals function. The logic behind this argument is simple: if an instructor needs to plan the learning experiences for a learner, knowing the individual's status or having a quantitative category into which to assign that individual is far less useful than knowing the way in which the student goes about solving intellectual problems. When one develops a sensitivity to the character of the learning process, one then has a guide to intervention in the modification of that process. My second priority then would be for an improved diagnostic assessment technology—a move from quantitative measures to qualitative measures which inform instructional design. The third follows naturally and involves matching student characteristics and needs to institutional capability and delivery patterns. Here I am simply suggesting that we need as much information about our institutions as we have traditionally had about our students.

In the 1970 report of the Commission on Tests of the College Entrance Examination Board, James Coleman wrote a very interesting little brief on "The Principle of Symmetry in College Choice"* He suggested that traditionally in our assessment and placement procedures in the transition from high school to college, we have tended to stack the deck on the side of the institution; we have provided the institution with a great deal of information about the youngsters, but we have given young people very little information about the institutions. I am simply suggesting that if we are to make better use of our institutions, if we are to expand opportunity, a higher degree of symmetry must be achieved here. Students need as much information about us and our capabilities to meet their needs as we need about them. Then having this exchange of symmetrical information, we would have the task of matching. But the match somehow must break the elitist bond between institutions and students. I would be very unhappy if we continued to concentrate our best students in our so-called best universities; rather I propose that we place more of our weakest students in our strongest institutions.

In the book that I wrote with Doxey Wilkerson on compensatory education,* we made the modest suggestion which nobody has picked up (in fact this has become the story of my life—most of my ideas don't get picked up). We suggested that maybe it's time for the strong institutions to assume greater responsibility for the education of the weakest students, or to put it differently, maybe my competence as a professor ought not to be measured by the number of bright Columbia University students I can help to win scholarships and earn degrees with honors, but how many average or high risk students I can help to make it through and even excel. It may be a far more difficult task to take average and low functioning individuals and bring them to levels of adequacy, if not excellence, than it is to preside over and monitor the development of those bright youngsters who are going to learn no matter what you do to them. I used to have a colleague who argued that the teacher's greatest job was to keep out of the way so that his students could grow and learn. It may be that we will have to move to a controlled lottery as a means of selecting students, where we select from categorized student pools and assign to categorized institutional pools; that is, if we understand enough about students and enough about institutions, perhaps, instead of letting the individuals and the institutions make the choices, what we need to do is to simply make admission a matter of stratified random selection.

You might say immediately we would run into difficulty because we would waste institutional resources because so many people would be misplaced. I suspect that with improved information and appropriate matching this would not be the case. But even if it were, the results could hardly be worse than our present performance. Astin has a rather interesting report looking at the relationship between college completion and college entrance test scores; he finds that the range of youngsters who complete college goes from the lower end of the scale to the very top, with relatively low correlation between positions on that continuum.* What these data seem to be saying is that there are factors other than ability which are operating to influence college completion and, since we don't know what those factors are, it may be that our earlier concentration on test scores and even grade point averages may be less useful than we think.

Fourth, we need expanded and strengthened tutorial programs, learning centers and targeted remediation. As we look around the country at the things that are working, we see programs that have solid tutorials that are based on small groups and one-to-one supportive instructional relationships. Another positive factor in these programs are learning centers, which are the closest thing to individualized approaches to instruction that we have in higher education. In these settings efforts are made to understand the learning problems of youngsters and to directly attack them. In addition, we see programs that have targeted their remediation. I am thinking of a program that John Munro developed at Miles College in Alabama. He has determined that there are about a thousand words that his students have difficulty with, and when they have mastered them they function much

*College Entrance Examination Board. Report of the Commission on Tests. *II. Briefs*. N.Y.: CEEB. 1970.

*See references of companion article (Rossmann, Astin et al)

better in their college work; thus, a part of this program simply concentrates on helping them master the meaning and usage of those particular words. He has also discovered that one of his sudents' recurring problems is their inability to differentiate the quality of information. All information is the same: you read *True Love Story*, the *New York Times*, the *Daily News*, your chemistry text, your sociology text—for many of them, if it's written then it must be fact.

Munro says that when he is able to teach his students how to distinguish the value of information that's available, the kind of evidence that's required to make certain kinds of judgements, they have acquired one of the simple skills that's essential to further progress in college. With his remediation he has targeted that specific aspect of this function which, when corrected, improves the quality of the function. Munro's work shows that we need to make a far more serious attack upon the problems of learning disability in adult learners. A rather elaborate field of learning disability has grown for educating children at the elementary level, not too much at the secondary level, but almost nothing at the college and young adult level. In fact, the only people in the country that I know of who have taken this problem of learning disability in adult learners seriously is the military, and they of course have been forced to if they are going to make something of the underdeveloped adults that they have drafted or receive now as volunteers.

Fifth, we need to develop a far more scientific study of and preparation for the design and delivery of instruction in colleges and universities. There can exist, in fact there is, a technology of instruction, and we constantly assert that teaching is a profession, yet those of us who work at the college or university level rarely have any formal preparation for the discharge of instructional responsibilities. These activities certainly carry a strong element of art, and there may always be some aspect of the artistic skill in them, but I contend that there are elements of science that can be brought to bear on the practice of pedagogy, and we need to rapidly and systematically introduce them.

Sixth, we will need radical changes in the functional character of higher education. We will have to develop reward systems for a far broader range of talents and experiences. This will take us into drastic curriculum reforms. We will need to move out of the hallowed halls of the institution into the mainstream of society, recognizing that there are *many varieties of individual learning patterns* and that the range of learnings that we have rewarded in the university may be too narrowly drawn both for the changing purposes of the society and the changing populations of our institutions. We will need to give greater attention to modeling, to experiencing, and to discovery as instructional techniques. I am always conflicted when I talk about this area because most of the time I am exalting people, yet I left the ministry when I recognized the fact that exaltation does not stop sinning. As an educational psychologist I know it certainly doesn't improve practice. If we really want to do something about the way people learn and what they're going to do with what they learn, we are going to have to find something to do other than just talking at them. We have to reduce the separation between the life of talk and the life of action.

Again, Jean Paul Sartre talks about the changing roles of the intellectual and even suggests that intellectuality may be incompatible with social purposes even though it can never be divorced from it. What I am suggesting is that those of us who have retreated from the action to do our thinking may have retreated so far that we are removed from the realities of the world, and our thinking is distorted or limited. I clearly do not believe that one who is forever or constantly in the midst of the action can do much analytic thinking—one does need to retreat from time to time—but maybe there has to be much more active movement in and out of the retreat and the struggle if the true honing of intellect is to be achieved. We will need to dignify native as well as esoteric wisdom. As we move among the people of this world we find that all wisdom does not reside in the professor; there is often far greater wisdom in the minds of people who have never seen the university. Unfortunately, we have not yet found ways to honor and to dignify that wisdom. Clearly, we need to reduce the separation among skill, morality, and intellect. My concern here is with the values by which our lives are determined, guided and influenced, the work that we do, the thought that gives us meaning to life. These are all one and they must be brought together if the considered and fulfilled life is to be lived.

Finally, opportunity for meaningful participation in the political, economic and social intercourse of the social order must be guaranteed as a right of citizenship. One might ask, what has this to do with achievement in higher education? John Ogbu, another anthropologist, has reminded us that one of the reasons education may be relatively ineffective for low status persons is that they see little relationship between the purposes and functions of formal study and the opportunity structure into which they move.* Asking them to devote their time to the studies or activities that supposedly make it possible for them to engage in the society is ridiculous since they see little opportunity for such intercourse. Back in the days when we were most concerned with school dropouts, Michael Miller, a social economist, startled us one day when he asked, "What would happen if we succeeded in keeping all these kids in school and we end up with a highly trained population with no jobs to go to?" Ogbu has suggested it may be unrealistic to expect people to seriously engage in the process of learning if the society provides little opportunity for their meaningful participation. The effectiveness of what we do in higher education may be tied to how our students perceive the quality of the opportunities for a satisfying life in the society.

These are just a few of the needed changes. I am certainly not so naive as to fail to understand that they are in some measure so radical that they are not likely to be immediately embraced. But it is change that is indicated and change which will occur. New members of the higher education community agree; they will add to the contradictions of the university, they will force the university to change; and as new waves of students, traditional and non-traditional, come, new institutions will emerge. The weight of the presence of these students and

*John Ogbu, *The Next Generation*. N.Y.: Academic Press, 1974.

the quality of our work with them will influence the form that these institutions take.

There is a telling passage from another of my favorite mentors, Max Otto, who was Professor of Philosophy at the University of Wisconsin. In a little book which he calls *The Human Enterprise*, there is a particular section where he's talking about new times and new ideas; the sentiments that he expressed there are a reflection, I think, of the kind of concern that we need to keep in mind as we consider the changing institutions that we have responsibility for. Otto wrote: "As I recall similar instances in the past and contemplate what is taking place in our own days, I think of a black oak that I have long admired. It rises seventy or eighty feet into the air, a thing of rugged beauty, every day of the year and every hour of the day. Whether seen in the searching light of noon or in the mellow colors of sunset, whether barely visible as a dim mass on a dripping sultry night or clearly etched against the sky at dawn—each recurring presence arouses a fresh sense of the oak tree's greatness as an achievement of life and intimates anew something of that unfathomable mystery that we call nature; that complexity of being into which every living thing sends its roots.

But it is not the impressiveness of this oak which just now brings it to mind, not its strength or dignity or beauty. It is its behavior in autumn and winter--if a tree may be said to behave. Unlike the maples and hickories in the same grove, it refuses to give up its leaves. Rains, snows, winds have no effect. The tug of the elements is powerless to bring them down. They change from green to red then to the color of the marshes when the winter's snows are first gone. They wrinkle, they dry up, they rustle in the breeze, but they do not release their grip. They linger through the winter as memories of departed days, haunt the mind of a man whom a change of fortune has retired from active life.

Then comes spring. In March the leaves appear to be thinning out and before April ends they are gone. What rains and snows and winds, blustering from without could not do, the quiet prod of life, working from within, does with ease. As the sun climbs higher in the zodiac, and the responsive sap ascends the tree trunk and ramifies into branches and twigs, the clinging leaves drop away." (And here is the part I particularly want to share with you.) Otto says, "For new leaves do not come because old leaves have fallen; the old leaves fall because new leaves are coming; or to speak more accurately, the life cycle of the tree turns from sustaining old leaves to developing new ones. It is true of the oak, it is true of the Tree of Life."

Curriculum Conference on Dramatizing the Black Experience

Dramatization—music, dance, role playing—as means by which children can understand themselves and others was the subject of a May 7, 1976, curriculum conference, sponsored by the General Assistance Center for Equal Educational Opportunity, a project of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, at Teachers College.

The use of drama as an integral curriculum component was discussed by more than 200 conference participants. Voices, Inc., a group of former educators, began the day with a pageant dramatizing the experience of blacks, from late seventeenth century Africa to twentieth century America.

Following the well-received performance by Voices, Inc., the attending teachers and administrators from the New York New Jersey area took part in a workshop and panel discussion regarding ways children might be allowed to dramatize historical events for the purpose of understanding the black experience. The participants were given resource materials—lists of pertinent books and organizations, articles regarding drama in education, resource guides and samples of historical materials—which might serve as bases for dramatizing the black experience in the classroom.

The General Assistance Center is at once committed to the principle of integrated education and to the importance of expression of racial, ethnic and sex identities.The purpose of the conference was to inform educators of an innovative way of generating understanding, leading to greater self regard by minorities and greater perspective by majorities. Judging by the appreciative evaluative comments by participants, the conference was quite successful in achieving its goal. For more information, write to:

Mr. Warren Halliburton
General Assistance Center for Equal Educational Opportunity
Box 047
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, N.Y. 10027

diverse but still select student clientele; and a mass of small four-year colleges and public and private two-year colleges that enroll students whose achievement has been undistinguished (p. 3, 4). The validity of this model is supported by literature pertaining to the base of this pyramid—which certainly would include black colleges, community colleges, and nonselective four-year colleges.

Coleman (1966) reported the existence of two sets of colleges, one 98 percent black, the other 98 percent white. In the mid 1960's approximately 50 percent of black college students were enrolled in predominately black colleges (Gordon 1972a), an improvement (some would think, others would not) over approximately 6[illegible] percent in the 1950's (Jaffe 1968). The idea of the black college has been subject to controversy and its legality questioned (see Pifer 1973; Cheek 1972; Bowles 1971; Jaffe 1968; Jencks 1967 for differing views). The black college has been criticized harshly. An extremely negative view is presented by Jencks and Riesman (1967) who consider the black college far too narrowly focused (on teacher training and vocational training) and frequently dedicated to white middle-class values. Jaffe (1968) has criticized the quality of education at most black colleges. Others (Crossland, McGrath), while admitting weaknesses, view the black colleges more positively, sensing their value with better planning and greater financial support. An extremely positive view of the role of the black college is presented by Cheek (1972). He asserts that since equal opportunity in higher education has not become a reality, the burden of opportunity must be borne by the black college. The black college can be the vehicle through which blacks can gain dignity and self-respect as well as the professional means with which to share in the power structure of the country. In this way a greater number of Blacks will be able to take a constructive part in a culturally pluralistic society and racism will be exposed.

Karabel (1973) reported that in 1973, one third of all students entering higher education entered through the doors of a community college (in California the figure is 80 percent). Further, he presents figures linking low socioeconomic status to enrollment in junior colleges. Twenty-nine percent of the respondents to the Gordon/Wilkerson (1966) survey that reported compensatory practices were two-year colleges. Controversy surrounds the idea of the junior or community college. Karabel deplores the tracking both into and within the junior college. The Center for Policy Research (1969) noted there are indications that some junior colleges may be more responsive to the affective needs of the disadvantaged student. Whatever its merit, the two-year college has been the subject of a considerable portion of the research in collegiate compensatory education (Baehr 1969; Karabel 1973; Losak 1971; Roueche 1968) and is a major force in higher education for the disadvantaged.

Finally, it is fairly well documented that disadvantaged students attend the least prestigious four-year colleges (Gordon 1972a; Kendrick 1965). Implications can be drawn from these statements regarding relationships between type and incidence of postsecondary enrollment and between socioeconomic status/ethnicity/prior educational experience and concomitant achievement level. These will become clearer upon closer examination of more specific practices in higher education in response to the need to serve diverse populations. Policy changes have occured in three broad areas in the structure of higher education: admissions/recruitment, financial aid, and curriculum. The practical responses to the necessity for change in these areas will now be discussed along with the theoretical issues involved.

Admissions

During the 1950's much attention was given to the need for finding and developing America's human resources. There were some new developments in the area, notably the establishment of the National Merit Scholarship program in 1955 to select talented youth for scholarships to college. Many colleges organized their financial aid programs along similar lines, ability rather than need being the major criterion (Wing and Wallach 1971; Thresher 1966). The College Entrance Examination Board began its College Scholarship Service in 1954 to counter the rising competition that often resulted in students with promise but with very little need being awarded scholarships. This program has ensured that talented youth selected for CSS awards do in fact have real need for the funds.

By the end of that decade new issues were surfacing. Some scholars began to question previous academic performances as an appropriate, sole measure of social, entrepreneurial, and creative abilities (McClellan 1958). They also called for curricular revision of educational programs to allow a "student to realize his potential within the framework of his own culture" (Astin 1972, p. 24) rather than mere provision of supportive services to enable the disadvantaged, culturally diverse student population to manage traditional coursework (Eels 1953; Gordon 1972a). Recently the practice of searching only for talented, developed students has become unacceptable to minority groups (Lane 1969). They believe higher education has a responsibility to provide educational access and useful experience to all citizens who desire it (Astin 1972; McGrath 1966).

In some states with fairly progressive programs for minority and nontraditional students (for example New York, New Jersey, California and Ohio) significant inroads have been made in admissions practices, even at some of the more prestigious institutions (Pifer 1973; Higher Education 1975). However, provisions to accommodate previously unacceptable students usually relate to outside sources of funding and do not indicate substantive revision of admissions policies.

The sole use of traditional predictors of college success, high school achievement records and SAT scores, has been questioned (for example, by Gordon 1965; Kendrick 1965; Society 1964). These predictors have been studied by numerous researchers (see Gordon 1972a for discussion of the various studies) with general agreement that these measures, particularly past achievement, are not without accuracy in predicting standard success; however, this may work to the

exclusion of the disadvantaged student population. These predictors "do not necessarily reveal a person's potential for being influenced by the college experience" (Astin 1972, p. 25). Furthermore, "we should not penalize students for their lack of preparation, but neither should we abolish all standards; to do so would be patronizing in that it would imply that the student is incapable" (Astin 1972, p. 25). But by using these predictors alone, we have penalized and excluded the poor and/or minority group member, which is antithetical to the ideal of equal opportunity (Rossman 1975).

Some recent studies that investigated the value of biographical data for predicting college success have suggested using them in evaluating disadvantaged candidates. Nonintellective factors such as family background, income, motivation, and attitude toward education may also be useful, although the use of predictors of success in college may vary with different populations (Gordon 1970; Hills 1965; Willingham 1964; Brown 1964; Garcia 1958; Webb 1960; Rossmann 1975). On the other hand, if enough characteristics and their functions can be identified that differentiate students with respect to their academic needs and strengths, then appropriate kinds of college experiences can be prescribed for individual students. This would mark a change in approach from predictive selection to prescriptive development. Prescriptive development would entail finding that college with the potential to provide the best college experience for a given student. Clearly the criterion for the admission of a disadvantaged student should be his potential to complete a college program.

The use of differential admission criteria for educationally disadvantaged students apparently is based on the belief that appropriate services (counseling, tutoring, remedial work) can bring the achievement level of these students to that of their regularly admitted counterparts (New York State [1973]). Although they may be educationally disadvantaged, nontraditional students often bring to the college a positive orientation, "street" sophistication, and motivation (Rossmann 1975). Colleges and universities can no longer be allowed to maintain a comfortably homogeneous student population.

Finance

Financial aid is the most critical factor in extending higher education to the disadvantaged and minority groups. Progress cannot be made unless substantial amounts of money are available for the support of students in higher education and the programs that serve them. The majority of disadvantaged students are from families with annual incomes of less than $8,000. Their families cannot afford to contribute to the cost of college; in fact, it may be necessary for them to make sacrifices because they are losing the potential financial contribution of the student. Thus the student from a poverty background often has feelings of guilt, feelings that he or she is abandoning the family. In addition, such a student often cannot afford to participate in the social activities of the college environment and may suffer psychological difficulties as a result. These psychological factors may contribute to lack of success and persistence on the part of the student.

There are positive correlations between attendance and family income and between family income and ethnic group membership (New York State [1973]; CEEB 1973). Costs of education have risen in the past few years but financial aid to students and programs for the disadvantaged have not increased proportionately (CEEB 1973). To further compound the financial problems of poor/minority students, the prestigious institutions with the highest academic standards are those with the largest endowment and scholarship funds (Colvard 1974). Poor students are not likely to meet the admission standards of these institutions because of their inferior elementary and secondary experience, so they attend less selective schools. Because of this they receive little in the way of alumni or private foundation or endowment support, which tends to be concentrated in the more selective institutions.

Federal aid takes the following forms: public scholarships, grants, guaranteed loans, subsidized loans, contingent repayment plans, workstudy programs, income tax relief, grants and favorable loans for buildings and equipment, and more general grants to institutions, including operation of low tuition schools by the government. The U.S. Office of Education presently administers five major programs for aiding students: Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, College Work-Study Program, National Defense Student Loans, and Guaranteed Loans. Approximately 25 percent of the nation's postsecondary students have been receiving some form of federal assistance. The Serviceman's Readjustment Act and Social Security plan account for 60 percent of federal aid at private colleges, and 80 percent at public colleges in New York State (University of the State of New York 1974). Despite the existence of these programs, federal aid has not been adequately funded to meet the needs of students who require the most help.

Only the Basic and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, the College Work-Study Program, and the National Defense Student Loan program endowments primarily serve needy students (CEEB 1963). Other federal grants (usually for research) are given to large universities rather than two- or four-year colleges, which enroll the greatest number of disadvantaged students. The amount of federal funds a student receives and the way in which the funds are packaged (the balance and the mixture of grants, loans, etc.) affect college access, choice of institution, and even the quality of educational performance of the student.

There are several other problems that seem to be built into federal programs for financial aid. There are limits on the amount of aid that institutions can supply to individuals; colleges with a large number of disadvantaged students are in a particularly difficult position because of government matching funds requirements; loan funds are limited and low income students must compete with lower risk students for funds; and more funds are distributed to students in the more expensive institutions than to students in the less costly institutions. Although the federal government's efforts to make funds available to institutions and students in need have been great and

consequential, adequate support for all students is lacking (CEEB 1973).

At present state aid is providing the most support for disadvantaged students. The type of aid varies from state to state. Some states distribute funds on the basis of need, some on the basis of ability, and some on a combination of these. Some of the best state programs are found in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, California, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, and Wisconsin (which makes special provisions for American Indians). [See *Higher Education in the States* (1975) and Boyd (1974) for comprehensive data].

Although recent federal legislation (Education Amendments of 1972) attempts to improve chances for disadvantaged populations to attain higher education, the problems of insufficient funds, inequitable distribution, and inefficient financial aid processes remain the most critical barriers to higher education for the disadvantaged.

Curriculum

No essential change in the overall college curriculum has occurred as a result of the addition of programs for the disadvantaged, although responsive practices have been introduced (Crossland 1971; Astin 1972; Gordon and Wilkerson 1966; Ruchkin 1972; Gordon 1970). There is a great deal of overlap among the various types of compensatory practices that have been implemented. The following discussion will focus on precollege preparatory programs, ethnic studies, remedial/developmental practices, counseling, tutoring, and study skills training.

Since high school graduation is a prerequisite for attendance at most colleges, precollege preparatory programs have been one of the most prevalent and successful innovations and it is well to begin a description of compensatory practices with them. Among them can be listed nationwide, federally funded programs such as Upward Bound and the Educational Talent Search program (Tinto 1973). Other programs have been sponsored by private foundations, for example College Bound and A Better Chance (ABC) (Gordon 1972a; Tinto 1973). Examples of noteworthy local programs should include SEEK and the College Discovery Program, both functions of CUNY (Tinto 1973; Dispenzieri 1969a and b); Dillard University's Prefreshman Program (Jennings 1967); the programs at Yale, Columbia, Rutgers, and Bronx Community College's Operation Second Chance. (These and many others are described in Gordon and Wilkerson [1966]).

Precollege preparatory programs typically involve recruitment from high schools, summer sessions on college campuses, and individual, intensive basic skills training. Evaluations of these programs are less than adequate and results are mixed, but generally these programs are considered successful, particularly in altering attitudes and fostering motivation.

Several programs have focused on recruiting and retaining disadvantaged students once they have been admitted. The Special Services Program, federally funded under the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, was directed toward this goal (Davis 1973). Some of the many colleges and universities that have made special efforts in this direction include Northeastern University in Boston, Morgan State University in Maryland, Knoxville College in Tennessee (Gordon and Wilkerson 1966), Michigan State University, New Mexico State University, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater (Tollefson 1973), University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign (Aleamoni 1974), Boston University (Smith 1972), the State of Vermont institutions (*Carnegie Foundation*, 1973), and the Thirteen-College Curriculum Program in North Carolina, a cooperative effort between black colleges and the Institute for Services to Education (Gordon 1972a).

The critical question is what specifically are these institutions doing to help their new recruits? A general pattern of responses is evident. First, the addition of ethnic studies programs is probably the most fundamental curricular change employed by colleges and universities in their attempt to serve the disadvantaged, specially admitted students. The Willie and McCord (1972) survey of black students in white institutions found black students very much in favor of black studies as the most crucial part of their educational experience. And Oliver (1975) describes a statewide secondary/collegiate effort to develop an ethnic (black) studies program in Alabama. It should be noted that some scholars believe that ethnic studies are and should be of equal importance to traditional students. Some minority students share this view (the subjects in Astin's 1972 survey). Ethnic studies should be incorporated into the curriculum of all departments to give the most comprehensive view of the multicultural nature of our society to all students. The author doubts, however, that this view is shared by many administrators and faculty.

Another prevalent practice among compensatory programs is the inclusion of remedial or developmental coursework (this often overlaps with precollege program practices). At worst, these courses are offered on a noncredit basis, rather like a continuation of high school. Understandably, this practice often demoralizes the new student (Gordon 1967; Gordon and Wilkerson 1966; Astin 1972; Roueche 1968). Some programs have begun to phase out this type of remedial course (Gordon 1967; Gordon and Wilkerson 1966). But at best, remedial courses have been characterized by innovative instructional techniques, such as a composite of classroom discussion, seminars, individual projects, field research, self-instructional or programmed materials, simulation, audio-visual instruction, study abroad, independent study, and interdisciplinary study. These are also some of the best techniques that have been used with the traditional student population. When compensatory, remedial courses are designed to meet the individual student where he is and build on his strengths, they facilitate his growth and transition into regular coursework.

Counseling, both vocational and personal, is characteristic of many of the programs for the disadvantaged. The literature that exists is not encouraging and quite equivocal. Astin (1972) cites several cases in which students either lost interest in the counseling facilities after a short time in the programs or expressed lack of interest from the outset. Rossmann, Astin et.al. (1975) in their report of CUNY nontraditional students found

that if students receive personal counseling there is a greater likelihood of attrition on their part. The Gordon (1972a) survey findings support Rossmann's in regard to the inefficiency of current counseling procedures for disadvantaged students. The Willie and McCord (1972) survey accounts show ambiguous findings regarding black students' attitudes toward black counselors. The author has observed negative attitudes toward counselors exhibited by nontraditional students, apparently the result of high school experiences, and suggests a change in approach from traditional techniques to "advocacy" for the disadvantaged student. It should be pointed out that findings indicative of failure of traditional counseling with disadvantaged students are not inconsistent with findings regarding counseling failure with regular students (Gordon 1969b).

Tutoring is an important feature of most programs for the disadvantaged. Research is more encouraging here, yet still conflicting and ambiguous. Astin (1972) and Rossmann (1975) found no evidence to support the value of tutoring. Other studies, however, have found evidence of its usefulness. Peer tutoring was reported a successful practice at Miami-Dade Junior College (Miami-Dade 1972), Northeast Missouri College, Kirksville (Wright 1971), and the Learning Center at the College of San Mateo (Wenrich 1971). Gordon (1972a) reported differing tutorial approaches and differing student reactions. Approaches included student tutors, paid tutors and faculty tutors, and students responded according to the tutor's personal characteristics and attitudes. For example, older peer tutors whose backgrounds were as disadvantaged as their tutees were effective in several of the responding institutions.

Study Skills Centers have also shown promise in the education of the disadvantaged (Gordon 1972a). These typically involve such features as seminars in note taking, preparing for exams, and assessing instructor styles and goals. Beitler and Marvin (1971) reported a successful program in study skills training at the New York City Community College.

OUTCOMES

The literature on educational outcomes is sparse for those researchers interested in and concerned about the status of programs for the disadvantaged. Like preschool programs, collegiate compensatory programs have failed to document the design as well as the implementation. Also, systematic data collection and analysis have been infrequent (Tinto 1973; CEEB 1973). The appropriateness of success of compensatory programs cannot be determined from the enthusiasm with which they were begun or the speed with which the practices spread. The crucial question is what aspect of the program actually accounted for successes or failures? Often programs were born out of political expediency either because institutions felt political pressure or because money became available if they would institute compensatory programs (Tinto 1973; Rossmann 1975). When outcomes failed to meet the expectations of administrators it was often forgotten that the lack of careful planning and clearly set goals have contributed more to failure then any lack of merit on the part of the educationally disadvantaged students. Staff for the compensatory programs were often quickly and therefore inappropriately chosen in the institution's effort to initiate special programs as rapidly as possible. As stated in the Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) study, little heed was paid to the compatibility of the intentions of special program staff and the intentions of the institution. Thus incongruence in goals often caused serious conflicts between administrators of the special programs and other university administrators. The program staff usually supported activist ideals not always espoused by the institution as a whole. Without tenure or other security, the incidence of staff turnover was quite high in special programs, which added another element of instability to these efforts (Astin 1972). In essence, the creators of compensatory programs neglected to address the issue of systematically changing the structure of the institution. The programs were often little more than political concessions, structural appendages without firm theoretical underpinnings, without well-thought-out practical foundations, and set apart from the main institutional process.

Funds necessary for effective program evaluation have yet to be appropriated for special programs. Agencies conducting evaluations from the outside sometimes evolve data quite different from that reported by the program participants. Most of the data are, in fact, narrative, self-reported descriptions. Self-evaluation is characterized by subjectivity in the absence of personnel trained in the methods of empirical evaluation.

Additionally, fears surrounding program evaluation have precluded or hindered sincere efforts in this direction. Program staff have felt threatened by evaluation because it seemed an indication of doubt regarding program effectiveness. In fact, evaluation at times preceded withdrawal of financial support or institutional backing. Institutional commitment to evaluate has been inconsistent and sometimes nonexistent. A primary reason is institutional unwillingness to deal with any inadequacies in these special programs, which would require extra expenditures for revisions or additional planning and valuable university manpower (Tinto 1973).

For evaluation of special programs to attain credence, criteria and procedures need careful planning. One of the most important areas to be examined is a program's ability to help a substantial number of its students complete the university's requirements for a degree. Prior to actual evaluation, a proper assessment of the items that are to be evaluated must be determined. These should include not only student performance but also program practices that may indicate effectiveness. The staff's interaction with students, the courses offered, the support services of counseling and tutoring all affect success with special students. Neither the program nor the institution should fear the discovery of lack of quality in their practices, for without feedback it becomes impossible to improve effectiveness or justify changes in procedures and practices to reach important goals.

To attain the sound evaluation necessary to determine and maintain program effectiveness, efforts must begin at the program level with stringent evaluation techniques and practices as part of the ongoing program process. To meet these needs, graduate and professional schools need to research and develop

programs for training persons in this field as researchers, evaluators, and practitioners. Properly trained personnel with a commitment to proper evaluation are extremely crucial for special program survival. The product of evaluation efforts will be a critical factor, since this information assists legislators and foundations who fund these programs and periodically judge their effectiveness.

Even though collegiate programs for the disadvantaged have not been evaluated properly or adequately, general statements regarding outcomes can be made and new questions can be raised. Generally, the performance of nontraditional students has been comparable to regularly enrolled students. Attrition rates have also been comparable, if not somewhat lower, for nontraditional students (see Gordon 1972a; Gordon and Wilkerson 1966; Astin 1972; Rossmann 1975; Tinto 1973).

These findings must be qualified on several counts. Some institutions have made deliberate attempts to retain their nontraditional students, realizing that adjustments to college academic work is usually accomplished during the first two years of college. Universities have felt the need to help these students reduce their anxiety and alleviate their fears of failure and build an adequate social, psychological, and educational support system for subsequent years. Often nontraditional students' grade-point averages have been based on less than a full course load (Astin 1972; New York State 1973). However, the extent to which this condition has compromised the validity of comparison of averages is questionable given the multitude of variables affecting the averages of both groups. Also, some faculty have established less stringent standards of performance for nonstandard students purely out of a patronizing attitude toward this clientele. Thus, the issue of achievement is confounded.

Perhaps one of the most important outcomes of collegiate compensatory programs is the evidence they give of postsecondary education's weakness in dealing with student diversities. The realization of the complexity of compensatory education has caused many educators to pause and reflect on how best to reverse the negative impacts of early educational and economic deprivation, social isolation, and ethnic discrimination. The problem is not simply pedagogical but involves family life and community life as well. As the breadth and complexity of the problem becomes clearer, so does the pedagogical issue and its interrelationship with these other factors. The pedagogical issue has to do with an awareness of the many ways learning takes place in diverse populations and the application of this awareness to follow optimum educational development on the part of students who have different backgrounds, opportunities, values, and patterns of intellectual and social functioning. Other considerations are the identification of academic standards and goals, and the influence of such factors as intervention by dedicated instructors and other students, as well as intangible factors such as the atmosphere of the university.

Compensatory education, in contrast to traditional higher education, has attempted to shift the responsibility for learning more toward the teacher than the student. In this context effective education is a product of the match between the learner characteristics, the learning environment, and the learning tasks (Hunt 1961). More accurate measurement of academic success may be the key to making the basic educational process more meaningful for compensatory programs. There is emerging interest in the use of instruments to assess the learning process as well as the level of achievement. It is increasingly recognized that general approaches to remedial or tutorial help are less likely to be effective than those targeted at specific aspects of learning. However, an examination of existing instruments and strategies for assessing student achievement reveals that few are effective in elucidating process, and that most present special problems when used with minority groups (Samuda 1973).

There has been a tendency to separate affective development from cognitive development. For a young child the mastery of a skill can enhance his feelings of confidence and create positive expectations that will aid future learning. When this process is hindered, as it so often is with the disadvantaged student, special care must be taken to redesign educational programs from early education through college to compensate for this loss of confidence. At the elementary and secondary levels special care should be taken to ensure that teachers attend to children's affective needs, their individual learning style, and their learning strengths and weaknesses. At the college level, attention should be given to the development of any basic skill that has not been developed.

Many (Gordon, Astin, for example) believe that the university needs to redefine its role in society and its responsibility for the education of all its members, whether or not they fit the the traditional college student model. Institutional nonresponsiveness to change not only affects the nontraditional student but all the other students as well. In many cases it has been the compensatory program and its struggle for survival that has brought the problems, and some solutions, to the fore. For example, financial support is beginning to be seen as a necessity for the middle income student as well as the low income student in view of rising costs of higher education and the current economic situation in the U.S. In curriculum, innovations such as tutorials and study skills centers, originally designed for the poorly prepared special student, are now seen as valuable techniques from which many traditional students can benefit.

Traditional admissions policies have been questioned because of the special needs and demands of compensatory programs. The type of student that the special programs seek does not meet the usual admissions criteria. His poor high school preparation and low achievement scores eliminate him if regular admissions procedures are followed. However, this problem is not limited to minority students. Many other students are beginning to fall into this category, such as older persons and those returning to school for retraining. Thus there is a need for institutions to reexamine their admissions criteria. An alternative approach is the use of external degree programs such as the Urban League Street Academy in New York City (secondary level).

Little attention has been given to the overall appropriateness of contemporary education. Yet the emphasis on

educational alternatives and compensatory education may require a basic change in institutions. Although it is easier to add extensions than to alter basic structures, clearly the best interests of disadvantaged students and compensatory education will be served when the quality of the mainstream programs and services of our schools is improved.

If higher education is to be democratized and made accessible to all segments of the population, the form and content of its offerings will have to be changed. There are several areas where change is needed. Unless postsecondary institutions are geographically accessible, many segments of the population will be left out (Crossland 1971). But physical access may not be as important as political considerations, since if the idea of equal access is not politically acceptable to the communities from which the students come, democratization will not take place. Higher education must have a change in image that is clearly articulated and reflects a desire to serve previously excluded clienteles.

Since wide differences exist in the characteristics and needs of diverse popluations, the options available to students must be plentiful. They must range from traditional liberal arts and preprofessional programs to career orientations to open-ended and continuing education. The content of coursework will need to reflect the interests and values of people whose purposes significantly vary. The manner in which learning occurs or is available must include formal, informal, and incidental experiences. In other words, democratized higher education in a pluralistic society must include multipurpose institutions that provide variable routes by which continuing education can occur.

CONCLUSIONS

Given the confused state of compensatory education at the collegiate level and the equivocal status of evaluation efforts, what may be said that is useful to practitioners and policy makers in this field? Despite the fact that good evaluation studies in this area have been few and the findings contradictory, it does appear that some conclusions may be drawn.

1. Where programs have been implemented with full systems of student support services, special opportunity students showed equal or higher grade-point averages than regular students of comparable ability and showed equal or higher retention rates than regular students (New York State Department of Education 1975; Rossmann 1975; Baehr 1969; Bridge 1970; Christensen 1971; Losak and Burns 1971; Smith 1972).

2. Where programs with full systems of student support services have been implemented special opportunity students show increased self-esteem and motivation (Maykovich 1970; Davis 1973; Gordon 1972a; Hunt and Hardt 1969).

3. Where special opportunity students are selected on the basis of previously demonstrated talent (good but not excellent high school academic average and/or moderately good college entrance exam scores), college completion rates exceed those of traditional college population and grade-point averages are comparable to those of traditional college populations (Clark and Plotkin 1963; Gordon and Wilkerson 1966).

4. If college completion is the criterion, high school admission test scores account for relatively little of the variance, since students completing college come in fairly equal numbers from the full range of scores (Astin 1969).

5. In programs for special opportunity students, where little systematic student support service is available or utilized, student achievement, retention rates, and graduation are low (Lavin and Jacobson 1973; Rosen 1973).

Although the state of the art is quite varied, some programs or program elements are emerging that show promise. Among these are:

1. Full systems of student support services that include:

- Financial aid, including necessary allowances for tuition, room and board, incidental expenses, and contributions to family support where necessary. The aid package may consist of Basic Opportunity Grant, loan, university grant, family contribution, and income from work
- Adjusted curriculum in which the special needs of the students are taken into account in planning course work
- Tutorial support
- Remediation where necessary, and
- Counseling and continuous social/psychological support (Gordon 1972a; New York State Department of Education 1975; Davis 1973; McDill 1969).

2. Many students, particularly special opportunity students, need to be protected from the impersonal atmosphere of the large university and provided with more intensive, small group, personal contact with faculty. A successful example has been described by Smith (1972). This program includes team teaching, core curriculum, extensive guidance counseling, and a highly student-centered orientation. The frequently reported success of tutorials (faculty and peer) is probably related to the personalization of the college learning experience. (See Miami-Dade 1972; Wright 1971; Wenrich 1971).

3. Traditional remedial courses seem relatively ineffective, but targeted remediation based on specific identified needs appears to be an effective approach. Such a program has been developed and implemented by John Munro (Gordon 1972a) and includes, among other elements, special attention to 1,000-essential-words college vocabulary (without mastery of which students are known to fail), and to information processing skills in which the emphasis is placed on evaluating the differential quality of various kinds of information and information sources.

4. Student motivation, retention, and achievement can be enhanced through full service programs that also give attention to the sociopolitical life of students. A program rich in all these elements has been described by Lopate (Gordon 1972a) and has as principal features, in addition to standard elements, a strong student advocacy stance and close, extensive ties to the third-world elements in the communities from which special opportunity students come.

5. Behavior modification or shaping—a method of altering attitudes and behaviors by means of positive and negative reinforcement—has been utilized with some success in promoting academic achievement and retention in college (Ruchkin 1972).

6. The introduction of course content that complements the nationalistic concerns of students has been widely utilized. Its direct impact on achievement has not been well documented, but its effect on student attitudes seems positive. For examples see Gordon (1972a) and Oliver (1975).

7. Since the test-taking behavior and study habits of many special opportunity students are weak, special attention to the development of these skills has been included in some programs. One of the early models for programs including these elements has been described by Froe (1966).

8. It is increasingly recognized that the problems of special opportunity students predate their admission to college. Several programs designed to prepare and aid adolescents in the transition from high school to college have been developed. Among these alternative schools, the best examples are the street academies (see Carpenter 1972). Other public school programs are described by Shaycroft (1967), Wessmann (1969 and 1973), Hawkridge (1968).

REFERENCES

The documents cited with ED numbers in the following bibliography may be read at facilities which house the ERIC microfiche collection. For information on these facilities, contact the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027. Microfiche and paper copies of these ERIC documents may also be purchased unless otherwise stated. Contact the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210 for detailed ordering information.

Aleamoni, L.M. and Bowers, J.E. "The Evaluation of a Special Education Opportunities Program for Disadvantaged College Students." *Research in Higher Education* 1 (1974): 151-164.

Astin, A.W. "The Folklore of Selectivity." *Saturday Review*, December 20, 1969.

Astin, H.S., et al. *Higher Education and the Disadvantaged Student*. Washington, D.C.: Human Service Press, 1972.

Baehr, R.F. *Project Success*. Final Report, December 1969. Washington: Office of Education, DHEW, 1969. 64p. ED 039 870.

Beitler, L. and Martin I. "The Deisgn and Implementation of a Learning Center for Career Oriented Students." Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Tampa, December 1971. 11p. ED 056 850.

Bowles, F. and DeCosta, F.A. *Between Two Worlds: A Profile of Negro Higher Education*. Hightstown, N.J. 08520: McGraw-Hill, 1971. ED 088 330. Not available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Boyd, Joseph D. "1974-75 Undergraduate State Scholarship/Grant Survey." Deerfield, Ill.: National Association of State Scholarship Programs, October 1974. Mimeograph.

Bridge, W.T., ed. "Research and Compensatory Education. What Are We Doing?" Proceedings of a workshop sponsored by the Florida Educational Research Association, Jacksonville, January 1970. 27p. ED 041 581.

Brown, W.M. and Russell, R.D. "Limitations of Admissions Testing for the Disadvantaged." *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 43 (1964): 301-04.

Carnegie Foundation. "Education for 'New' Students: How's It's Done in Vermont." *Carnegie Quarterly* 21 (Fall 1973): 1-3.

IRCD Bulletin

SUBSCRIPTION NOTICE

The **IRCD Bulletin** is published quarterly on a calendar year basis. The cost of a subscription is $4.00 per year (four issues). In order to subscribe, please complete the form below and send it with your check or money order for $4.00 to:

Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Box 40
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

Subscriptions must be prepaid. Please make check or money order payable to Teachers College. Subscriptions are accepted for complete calendar year volumes only.

Please enter my subscription to the **IRCD Bulletin.** Enclosed is $4.00. I understand that I will receive four issues.

Name .....

Address .....

..... Zip Code .....

Please check one of the following categories which best describes your affiliation:

- ☐ College or University
- ☐ Elementary or Secondary School/System
- ☐ Governmental Agency
- ☐ Library or Information Center
- ☐ Public or Private Agency
- ☐ Other (Please specify)

.....

Carpenter, E.F. "Harlem Prep: An Alternative System of Education." In *Opening Opportunities for Disadvantaged Learners*, edited by A.H. Passow. NY: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Center for Policy Research. *Postsecondary Education and the Disadvantaged*. Washington: Office of Education, DHEW, Bureau of Research, 1969. 131p. ED 034 839.

Cheek, K.V. "The Philosophical Justification for Black Colleges in a Multiracial Society." Address before the American Association for Higher Education, 27th National Conference, March 1972. 9p. ED 061 871.

Christensen, F.A. "The Development of an Academic Support System for Educationally Disadvantaged Students." Paper presented at the APGA meeting, Atlantic City, 1971. 11p. ED 050 211.

Clark, K.B. and Plotkin, L. *The Negro Student at Integrated Colleges*. NY: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, 1963.

Coleman, J. et al. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington: DHEW, Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1966. 235p. ED 012 275.

College Entrance Examination Board. *Toward Equal Opportunity for Higher Education. Report of the Panel on Financing Low-Income Minority Students in Higher Education*. NY: CEEB, 1973. 82p. ED 077 463.

Colvard, R. and Bennett, A.M. *Patterns of Concentration in Large Foundations' Grants to U.S. Colleges and Universities*. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1974.

Crossland, F.E. *Minority Access to College*. NY: Schocken Books, 1971.

Davis, J.A., et al. "The Impact of Special Services Programs in Higher Education for Disadvantaged Students." Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service draft to the Office of Education, 1973. Mimeograph.

Dispenzieri, A., et al. *The College Discovery Program: A Synthesis of Research*. NY: CUNY, Research and Evaluation Unit for Special Programs, 1969a. 76p. ED 041 070.

_____. *Characteristics of SEEK Program Students: September 1968 Entering Class*. NY: CUNY, Research and Evaluation Unit for Special Programs, 1969b. 49p. ED 041 069.

Eels, K. "Some Implications for School Practices of the Chicago Studies of Cultural Bias in Intelligence Tests." *Higher Education Review* 23 (1953): 284-97.

Froe, O.D. "Meeting the Needs of College Youth: the Morgan State College Program." *Journal of Negro Education* 35 (1966): 422-29.

Garcia, D. and Wingham, N. "Validity of SSHA Administered Before and After College Experience." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 8 (1958): 845-51.

Gordon, E.W. *Opportunities in Higher Education for Socially Disadvantaged Youth. From High School to College: Readings for Counselors*. NY: CEEB, 1965.

_____ and Wilkerson, D.A. *Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged*. NY: CEEB, 1966.

_____. "Transition from School to College. A Review of the Literature." *Review of Educational Research* 40 (February 1970): 151-79.

_____, et al. "Report of the Study of Collegiate Compensatory Programs for Disadvantaged Youth." 1972a. Unpublished report submitted to the Ford Foundation.

_____. "Perspectives on Counseling and Other Approaches to Behavioral Change." Paper delivered at the invitation of the Division of Counseling Psychology, New York, 1972b.

Hawkridge, D.C., et al. *A Study of Selected Exemplary Programs for the Education of Disadvantaged Chidren*. Final Report, Project 089013. Palo Alto: American Institutes for Research in Behavioral Sciences, 1968. Part I, 118p. ED 023 776. Part II, 341p. ED 023 777.

Higher Education in the States 5 (1975): 1-24.

Hills, J.R. *Admissions Procedures that Make Sense*. Research in Higher Education, NY. CEEB, 1965.

Hunt, D.E. and Hardt, R.H., "The Effect of Upward Bound Programs on the Attitudes, Motivation, and Achievement of Negro Students." *Journal of Social Issues* 25 (1969): 117-129.

Hunt, J.McV. *Intelligence and Experience*. New York: Ronald Press, 1961.

Jaffe, A., et al. *Ethnic Higher Education—Negro Colleges in the 60's*. NY: Praeger, 1968.

Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. "The American Negro College." *Higher Education Review* 37 (Winter 1967): 3-60.

Jennings, F.S. "For Such a Tide Is Moving..." In *Education for the Disadvantaged*, edited by A.H. Passow, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.

Karabel, J. "Community Colleges and Social Stratification." In *Educating the Disadvantaged*, edited by E. Flaxman. NY: AMS Press, 1973.

Kendrick, S.A. "College Board Scores and Cultural Bias." *College Board Review* 55 (Winter 1964-65): 7-9.

Lane, H. "The Black Agenda for Higher Education." *College Board Review* 67 (Spring 1969): 6-20.

Lavin, D.L. and Jacobsen, B. "Open Admissions at the City University of New York: A Description of Aacedmic Outcomes after Three Semesters." April 1973. 38p. ED 078 808.

Losak, J. and Burns, N. *An Evaluation of the Community College Studies Program for the Year 1969-70*. Miami: Miami-Dade Junior College, 1971. 118p. ED 056 683.

McClelland, D.C., et al. *Talent and Society*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1958.

McDill, et al. *Strategies for Success in Compensatory Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

McGrath, E.J. *Universal Higher Education*. NY: McGraw Hill, 1966.

Maykovich, M.K. *Black, Asian and White Students in the Educational Opportunity Program*. Washington: National Center for Educational Research Development, DHEW, 1970. 105p. ED 073 220.

Miami-Dade Junior College. *The Peer Teaching Program of Community College Students*. Miami-Dade Junior College, March 1972. 55p. ED 060 837.

New York State. "Higher Educational Opportunity Program." Final report 1972-73. [1973.] 108p. ED 086 045.

New York State Department of Education, Higher Education Opportunity. *Guidelines for the Submission of Grant Proposals for Fiscal Year 1974-75*. Albany: New York State Department of Education, 1975.

Oliver, L.W. "Ethnic Heritage Studies Program." Birmingham: Miles College, Alabama Center for Higher Education, 1975. Unpublished.

Pifer, A. *The Higher Education of Blacks in the United States*. Al-

fred and Winifred Memorial Lecture for 1973, Johannesburg, South Africa, August 1973. NY: Carnegie Corp., 1973.

Rosen, D., et al. "Open Admissions: The Promise and the Lie of Open Access to American Education." 1973. 176p. ED 082 603.

Rossmann, J.E., Astin, A.W., et al. *Open Admissions at the City University of New York. An Analysis of the First Year*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1975.

Roueche, J.E. *Salvage, Redirection or Custody?* Los Angeles: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968. 77p. ED 019 077.

Ruchkin, J.P. *Selected Issues in Collegiate Compensatory Education*. In *Opening Opportunities for Disadvantaged Learners* edited by A.H. Passow. NY: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Samuda, R.J. "Racial Discrimination Through Mental Testing: A Social Critic's Point of View." *IRCD Bulletin* 42 (May 1973): 1-16.

Shaycroft, M.F., et al. *The High School Years. Growth in Cognitive Skills*. Interim Report 3 to the U.S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project 3051. Pittsburgh: Project Talent Office, American Institutes for Research and the University of Pittsburgh, 1976.

Smith, G.M. "The Two-Year Compensatory Program of the College of Basic Studies: Implications of a Successful Model." In *On Equality of Educational Opportunity*, edited by F. Mosteller and D.P. Moynihan. NY: Vintage, 1972.

Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. *Guidelines for Testing Minority Group Children. Journal of Social Issues* 20 (1964): 129-45.

Thresher, B.A. *College Admissions and the Public Interest*. NY: CEEB, 1966. ED 016 277. Not available from ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Tinto, V. and Sherman, R.H. *The Effectiveness of Secondary and Higher Educational Intervention Programs: A Critical Review of the Research*. NY: Teachers College, Columbia University, September 1974. 133p. ED 101 042.

Tollefson, A.L. *College Student Development in Evolution—with Special Focus on the Disadvantaged*. Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1973. 156p. ED 082 632.

University of the State of New York. *Financial Aid for New York State Students*. Albany: University of the State of New York, State Education Department, March 1974. 148p. ED 090 867.

Webb, S.C. "The Comparative Validity of Two Biographical Inventory Keys." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 44 (1960): 178-83.

Wenrich, J.W., et al. *Keeping Dropouts In: Retention of Students Identified as High Probability Dropouts*. Washington: DHEW, March 1971. 32p. ED 047 684.

Wessman, A.E. "Evaluation of Project ABC (A Better Chance). An Evaluation of Dartmouth College-Independent Schools Scholarship Program for Disadvantaged High School Students." 1969. 358p. ED 031 549.

. "Scholastic and Psychological Effects of a Compensatory Education Program for Disadvantaged High School Students: Project ABC." In *Educating the Disadvantaged*, edited by E. Flaxman. NY: AMS Press, 1973.

Willie, C.V. and McCord, A.S. *Black Students at White Colleges*. NY: Praeger, 1972.

Willingham, W.W. Paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, 1964. NY: CEEB, 1964.

Wing, C.W. and Wallach, M.A. *College Admissions and the Psychology of Talent*. NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1971.

Wright, R.M. *The Effects of Organized Tutoring and Advising by Upperclassmen with "Predicted Unsuccessful" Freshmen*. Washington: Office of Education, DHEW, National Center for Educational Research and Development, July 1971. 39p. ED 059 696.

Call for Documents

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, under the auspices of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, is constantly seeking documents such as research reports, program evaluations, instructional materials, bibliographies, surveys, conference papers and proceedings which deal with the education of urban and minority populations. Teachers, administrators, researchers, and others are invited to submit two copies of any appropriate document to:

ERIC/CUE
Box 40
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

Copies should be clearly printed and accompanied by an abstract, if possible.

Reprints Available

The following reprints or ERIC/CUE publications are available for $2.50 each from:

Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Box 40
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

All orders must be prepaid. Please make check or money order payable to Teachers College.

UDS 30. The Exemplary Teacher of the Disadvantaged: Two Views, Adelaide Jablosnky. 38p., July 1972.

UDS 31. Women: Their Education and Career Roles, An Annotated Bibliography of Selected ERIC references, Jean Barabas. 66p., August 1972.

UDS 36. Nutrition and Mental Development, Joan Dye Gussow. 41p., February 1974.

UDS 41. Human Relations in the Classroom, an Annotated Bibliography, Supplement IV. Raja Jayatilleke. 51p., July 1975.

UDS 42. Puerto Ricans on the Mainland, an Annotated Bibliography, Sarah Bobson. 81p., August 1975.

UDS 43. The Education of Asian Americans: A Bibliography, Raja Jayatilleke. 48p., August 1975.

UDS 44. Legal Rights and Remedies of High School Dropouts and Potential Dropouts, Michael A. Rebell. 57p., August 1975.

UDS 45. Health and the Urban Poor: A Bibliography, Adepu Bikshapathi and Linbania Jacobson. 40p., August 1975.

UDS 46. Voucher Schools: Who Participates? Julie Blackman. 66p., August 1975.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE PUBLICATIONS

Single copies of the following materials are available free of charge for as long as the supply lasts from:

ERIC/CUE
Box 40
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

IRCD Bulletins

VOL. II, No. 4A. Contingency Management, Lloyd E. Homme; Shyness, Non-Speaking and the PPVT, Robert T. Reeback. 4p., 1966.

Vol. VIII, Nos. 3 & 4. Title IV in the Sixties, Erwin Flaxman and Doris Mosley; Public Service Employment: A Poorly Publicized Opportunity, Gertrude S. Goldberg. 16p., May-September 1972.

Vol. VIII, No. 5. Community Control in Perspective, Nicolaus Mills. 12p., November 1972.

No. 42. Racial Discrimination Through Mental Testing: A Social Critic's Point of View, Ronald J. Samuda. 20p., May 1973.

Equal Opportunity Reviews

June 1975. New Curricula for Multi-Ethnic Schools, Harry Passow. 6p.

July 1975. Going Beyond Labels: The Significance of Social Class and Ethnicity for Education, Joseph C. Grannis. 6p.

August 1975. Public Schools and the New Segregation Struggle, Nicolaus Mills. 4p.

Doctoral Research Series

No. 5. Research on the Education of Black and Black-White Populations: An Annotated Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations, Adelaide Jablonsky. 86p., July 1974.

Conference Proceedings

No. 6. Proceedings of: 1. The Research Conference on Racial Desegregation and Integration in Public Education; 2. The Invitational Conference on Social Change and the Role of Behavioral Scientists. 176p., 1966.

No. 8. Proceedings of the Research Dissemination and Training Conference on the Education of the Disadvantaged. 162p., June 1967.

IRCD BULLETIN
Edmund W. Gordon, Editor

Teachers College, Columbia University
Box 40
525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

Volume XI, Number 1

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED